

Statement

State-wise tentative allocation of Funds to various States for implementation of O.P.P. during 1997-98

(Rs. in lakhs)		
S.No.	State	Govt. of India's share
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1100.00
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	40.00
3.	Assam	175.00
4.	Bihar	100.00
5.	Gujarat	600.00
6.	Haryana	200.00
7.	Himachal Pradesh	35.00
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	75.00
9.	Karnataka	625.00
10.	Kerala	50.00
11.	Madhya Pradesh	1249.00
12.	Maharashtra	1050.00
13.	Manipur	110.00
14.	Meghalaya	20.00
15.	Orissa	500.00
16.	Punjab	100.00
17.	Rajasthan	1100.00
18.	Sikkim	55.00
19.	Tamil Nadu	875.00
20.	Tripura	35.00
21.	Uttar Pradesh	575.00
22.	West Bengal	250.00
Total		8919.00

[Translation]

Self Employment Schemes

4847. SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR : Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(a) whether the self-employment schemes being run have been reviewed and the number of youths actually got employment under this scheme during the last three years;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether any complaints of irregularities have been received under this scheme; and

(d) if so, the steps being taken to check them?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH) : (a) Yes, Sir. The self-employment schemes namely Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) and Prime Minister Rozgar Yojana (PMRY) are regularly reviewed by Government from time to time. The number of rural poor families assisted under IRDP and the beneficiaries provided loans/financial assistance under the PMRY during the last three years, (i.e. 1994-95 to 1996-97) are given below:-

(Lakh No.)

	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
Families assisted under IRDP	22.15	20.90	14.14*
Beneficiaries Sanctioned Loans by banks under PMRY	1.98	2.00	2.18

* Upto February, 1997.

(b) Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) is reviewed in the Central Level Coordination Committee (CLCC), State Level Coordination Committee (SLCC) and at the district level by the Governing Body of the District Rural Development Agency (DRDAs). This programme is also reviewed through regular progress reports from the States on key indicators and through an intensive regimen of field inspections by officers of the Centre, State and implementing agencies. Periodic review meetings with State Secretaries in charge of Rural Development and Conferences of Project Directors of DRDAs are also held to review the progress under this scheme. Monitoring and Vigilance Committees have been set up at the State, district and block levels in which elected representatives of the people have been associated to monitor the implementation of this scheme. The IRDP was also reviewed by an Expert Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri D.R. Mehta, former Deputy Governor, Reserve Bank of India.

Furthermore, to assess the overall impact of IRDP in relation to its specific objective, the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment undertakes periodic Concurrent Evaluations of this programme through independent recognised institutions/organisations. The main findings of the latest Concurrent Evaluation Report on IRDP (September, 1992 to February 1993) is given in the statement enclosed.

A High Powered Committee under the chairmanship of Secretary, Department of Small Scale Industries, Agro &

Rural Industries periodically reviews the performance of PMRY and necessary policy corrections are made in the programme from time to time.

(c) and (d) No complaints of any major irregularities have been reported under PMRY and IRDP. However, whenever general complaints are received they are sent by the concerned nodal Ministry to the State Government for necessary enquiry and appropriate action.

Statement

Concurrent evaluation of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) (September 92 - February 93)

Executive Summary

A. Positive Points

1. In the selection of beneficiary families, the analysis revealed that 51.5% of the families were selected by the Gram Sabha, 43% by local officials and rest around 5% by public representatives and other agencies. Thus a large percentage of beneficiary families were selected by the Gram Sabhas.

2. Among the weaker sections, benefits accruing to the persons belonging to the physically handicapped and assignees of surplus land was quite encouraging. Roughly 34.1% of the physically handicapped and 43.2% of the assignees of surplus land were benefited by the IRDP programme.

3. The analysis of the assets provided to the beneficiaries revealed that a large percentage (63%) of families were provided assets under the primary sector and among the sub-sectors of the primary sector, nearly 50% assistance was given for milch animal.

4. As to the perception about the cost of assets given to the beneficiaries, the analysis revealed that in 85% cases, the beneficiaries felt that the assets given to them were not of lower cost.

5. A very large percentage (96%) of the beneficiaries felt that the type of assets provided to them were according to their choice.

6. As to the quality of the assets provided to the beneficiaries, roughly 69.42% were found to be of good quality.

7. The analysis of the family income of the beneficiaries revealed that a large percentage (56.58%) of the families had annual family income from assets of more than Rs. 2000.

8. With regard to overdues/recoveries from the beneficiaries, the survey results revealed that in majority of the cases (59%), no overdues were reported and only in

41% cases there were some overdues. Thus the recovery rate from the beneficiaries was generally satisfactory.

9. As to the borrowing by the beneficiaries from private sources after acquiring the assets, the survey results revealed that a very high percentage (95%) of the beneficiaries did not borrow any money from private sources.

10. As regards availability of input and marketing facilities for the assets provided to the beneficiaries, the analysis revealed that such facilities were available to a large extent in the Primary Sector.

11. In terms of overall per family investment (including both subsidy and credit), the analysis revealed that it was highest i.e. Rs. 7613 in the case of tertiary sector followed by Rs. 7268 in the primary sector and Rs. 6307 in the secondary sector.

12. For all the three major sectors taken together, the study revealed that 14.81% of the old beneficiary families could cross the revised poverty line of Rs. 11,000 and 50.4% of families were able to cross the old poverty line of Rs. 6,400.

13. The linkage of TRYSEM with IRDP was also analysed. It has been observed that in 56.23% cases, the beneficiaries received assistance for the same trade/activity for which they were trained.

B. Areas of Concern

1. It has been observed that the extent of second dose of assistance given to the 'old' beneficiaries was very low. Only 3.28% of total 'old' beneficiaries were given a second dose. Similarly, in the cases of new beneficiaries, the extent of second dose of assistance was still less than 2.61%. Thus, not much attention was paid for providing subsequent doses of assistance to the eligible families.

2. It was observed that the annual family income of the assisted families was under estimated during the BPL survey since as per the assesment made by the investigator, nearly 4% of the beneficiary families had an annual family income of more than Rs. 11,000 but as observed from records, there was no family with annual income of more than Rs. 11,000 per annum.

3. As regards, awareness among the beneficiaries about the Group Life Insurance, the study revealed that majority (58%) of the beneficiaries were not aware of Group Life Insurance Scheme. This shows that due publicity was not given to the Group Life Insurance Scheme.

4. The settlement of the claims preferred by the beneficiaries for perished assets was also analysed. It was observed that in 56% cases the claims remain unsettled.

5. As regards supply of Vikas Patrikas to the

beneficiaries, the study revealed that only a small percentage (32%) of the beneficiaries were supplied with Vikas Patrikas, which is a very serious matter.

6. The linkage of IRDP with TRYSEM and DWCRA was found to be very poor. While only 2.13% of the families reported that any of their members were assisted under DWCRA, 3.88% of beneficiaries reported receiving training under TRYSEM.

[English]

Open Sale Prices of Wheat

4848. SHRI G.A. CHARAN REDDY : Will the Minister of FOOD be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to news-item captioned "FCI wheat price flip-flop: Insiders make Rs. 100 crores" appearing in *The Economic Times*, dated March 20, 1997;

(b) if so, the facts thereof;

(c) whether the Government have conducted any inquiry into the matter;

(d) if so, the outcome thereof; and

(e) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (EXCLUDING THE DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL HUSBANDRY AND DAIRYING) AND MINISTER OF CIVIL SUPPLIES, CONSUMER AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION AND MINISTER OF FOOD (SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA) :

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Keeping in view the gap in the market prices vis-a-vis the open sale prices of FCI wheat, to neutralise the increased freight element paid by FCI in moving wheat from procuring to the consuming areas, to reduce the subsidy burden on open sale and to discourage traders to make undue profit, the Government, on the recommendations of the High Level Committee, revised open sale price of wheat with effect from 4.2.97. The new price range was from Rs. 4900/- to Rs. 7900/- per MT.

Representations were received from some of the State Government against this revision in prices. The matter was re-examined and the prices were again revised with effect from 10th March, 1997 valid till 31st March, 1997. The revised price range was Rs. 4900/- to Rs. 6800/- per MT.

The news item mentioned in part (a) of the question refers to this increase and subsequent reduction in the price range of open sale wheat. It claims that those who had early indications of these changes made undue profits. The news item refers to steep hike in open sale prices of

FCI wheat for Western, Southern and Eastern regions in February 1997. It further says that the higher prices were retained for a month in spite of criticism from various State Governments, etc. The news item also refers to certain sections in Maharashtra who are opposed to movement of indigenous wheat from Maharashtra to other States.

The question of protecting the interest of a section of the purchasers as alleged in the Press report does not arise. Stringent conditions were imposed in the Government notification of 10th March, 1997 stipulating that the purchasers of open sale wheat will have to be sponsored by the States/UTs and that their undertaking about the prices of wheat/wheat products being fixed by States/UTs were to be rigidly enforced. Similarly, movement of imported wheat to consuming areas is to be regulated in accordance with the advice of the Directorate of Plant Protection and Quarantine of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Over a period of time, policy guidelines on open sale of wheat were reviewed and stringent conditions were imposed so that unscrupulous elements do not take advantage of the scheme.

(c) to (e) In view of the facts explained in part (b) of the Question, the question of conducting any inquiry of the matter does not arise.

RDX Blasts

4849. SHRI MAHESH KUMAR M. KANODIA :
SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA :
SHRI KASHIRAM RANA :

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) the details of RDX-explosive blasts in the country during 1997;

(b) the number of casualties and other damage caused to the public and other property including the railway property;

(c) the details of the militant, anti-social and other organisations found involved in these blasts; and

(d) the steps taken to bring the culprits to book and the action taken against them?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI MOHD. MAQBOOL DAR) : (a) and (b) 168 blasts including RDX explosions took place in Jammu & Kashmir during the current year (upto April 15, 1997), in which 69 persons were killed, 26 houses, 10 shops and one school building and 6 vehicles were damaged. In the rest of the country, as per information available, 27 blasts were reported killing 12 persons and injuring 85. Details of damage caused to public property etc. in States other than Jammu & Kashmir is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.